tend more to injure the cause of true religion, than by placing one who denied Christ in one of the most prominent positions in the country? Have we reached the point where we may be said to hold that it does not matter what a man believes, if he is honest and moral? Will honesty and morality save any man?

There are men in Congress who are prominent elders and members of various Christian churches, who sit with their mouths shut, and it may be voted for this man for chaplain.

I ask, in view of such facts, what impression will be made on the young people of our land? What will other nations, especially those to whom we send missionaries to teach Christ and his gospel, think? Christ as the divine Savior, the only way of salvation? What are we to say when told in 2 John 10-11, "If there come any among you and bring not this doctrine receive him not into your homes, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is a partaker of his evil deeds."

Would it be possible to do more to advance the cause of Unitarianism, which is subversive of the whole doctrine of Christ than by placing their leaders in prominent, I may say, the most prominent positions before the country?

It seems to me if the devil ever laughs over his triumphs, he has great cause to laugh, when he makes such triumphs as the placing of his men in prominent places, where they do so much for his kingdom, by leading men away from the truth.

Statesville, N. Y.

W. W. M.

WHY IS IT.

At the last General Assembly there were overtures, before the committee on "Bills and Overtures," from two or three Presbyteries, relative to rotation of office of elders and deacons. These overtures were killed in the committee, just as others have been at former General Assemblies. As this subject keeps bobbing up, and receives the same treatment by successive Assemblies it occurs to some of the members who read, and take an interest in such things, that there should be at least a setting forth of some reasons why this rotation in office should not be allowed in the "Presbyterian Church in the United States." Surely there are reasons, and it is to be hoped not unscriptural, for the frequent overturing by presbyteries on this subject. The adoption of the committee's recommendation, "That this overture be answered in the negative," without discussion, is not satisfying, nor does it relieve the pressure in the actual working of church government, which doubtless causes the sending up of these overtures. The overturing parties are entitled to know what article in the "Book" fixes life tenure to installation. Paragraph 113, Chap. vi., does show the Presbyterian doctrine of perpetual ordination-but the same paragraph with 114 and 115 shows that installation is not.

Now that there are serious hinderances in the working of many churches under the present system cannot be questioned. Why does not some one, who is inclined to think this subject too puerile to be considered, just condescend once to explain the matter for the benefit of the "restless."

THREE TYPES OF PREACHERS.

One of these is fully up to middle age; a good man, has been useful during twenty or more years of his ministry and occupies an important position. I heard him preach not long since an orthodox and instructive discourse, but delivered with a good deal of vociferation and eccentricity of manner. The chief point of criticism lies in his addressing himself most largely to the ceiling and the vacant corners of the church, leaving his hearers out of the range of his eye or the sound of his voice and consequently both without interest in and, mostly, knowledge of, what was being proclaimed. I saw an officer of the church in front of me reading hymns while the preaching was going on; others appeared listless and tired.

The second type is a young man of modesty, who had a well prepared discourse. His manner was quiet, reverential and becoming, but it was accompanied by two radical defects: 1st, he looked down at the Bible far more than at the people, and 2nd, he spoke too rapidly and with indistinct enunciation, thus cutting himself off from the sympathy of the congregation and failing to derive inspiration from it. The public speaker, especially the preacher, has for his object the fixing of truth in minds of men. This must be done through the eye in gaining attention and through the voice in conveying instruction. Hence the value of the right use of these organs in the ministration of the word.

The third type comes between the other two in age and experience. He, too, gave us a well-prepared and useful discourse,—the best, perhaps, of the three; fixed and kept his eyes on the people; spoke in a calm, clear and audible voice; gained and held their attention, instructed their minds and sent them to their homes stronger Christians and better prepared for the duties of life.

My impression is that the last type did far more good by his sermon than both the others put together. Let young men, in or looking forward to, the ministry, pause, consider and fit themselves for their work.

An Interested Hearer.

PREACH DOCTRINE.

It is marvelous how many people are afraid of the word "doctrine." The cry is: "Don't preach doctrine; you will give offense." Such sentiments spring from the broad-gauge liberalists of the day, from those who are just as ready to smile upon error as upon truth, from those who are ready to join in a union hurrah and discard everything not indorsed by others, from those who are conscious of holding error and who have a motive in suppressing truth.

Such persons overlook the fact that doctrine means teaching; and if they really teach anything, they are preaching doctrine, either true or false. The word "doctrine" in the New Testament is always in the singular when it refers to right teaching. Hence we read of "his doctrine, sound doctrine, good doctrine, doctrine which is according to godliness," etc. On the other hand, you read of the "strange doctrines, the doctrines of men, the doctrines of devils," etc. Does not this mean that the whole teaching of Jesus, the entire gospel, the divine plan of salvation, is one great unit, while the teaching of error is broad and liberal and lax?—Western Recorder.